

meets his psychological needs to say he is renouncing the nuclear deal. But the fact is we don't have to renounce the nuclear deal and liberate Iran from its obligations in order to impose the toughest imaginable sanctions on this regime that is doing so much evil.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

THE RIGHT OF SELF-DETERMINATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, let me just note I believe that our President is doing a terrific job. I think that the last Presidents of the United States have left us an incredibly dangerous situation, and this President is trying to deal with it with strength and purpose, and, yes, being a forceful leader.

For example, during the Clinton administration, we provided \$4 billion to \$5 billion to North Korea, the same way the last administration tried to provide funds for Iran.

What do we have now?

A crisis with possible nuclear weapons and missiles in North Korea. That is called kicking the can down the road. They sure kicked it down to us, and now the people want to kick the can down the road with the Iranians. No, let's not do that again and leave future generations to face the music that we left them.

Our President wants to make sure that Iran does not become a nuclear power as long as it is controlled by radical, fanatic mullahs who don't even represent their own people. In fact, if Iran was more peaceful and actually more democratic, then we wouldn't have to worry about that because they wouldn't want to have a wasteful program of nuclear weapons.

Those are the type of issues we face today. We face a lot of uncertainties at home and abroad, and it behooves us to look for explanations for the shifts in power, the dangers, and the influence that are taking place in the world today.

Europe, along with the United States, for five decades, seemed to be the center of world order and progress. NATO, the European Union, and the common market all seemed to be the epitome of sophisticated and proper governance needed to offset humankind's destructive and combative inclinations. World Wars I and II had undercut, if not destroyed, the expansion of classical liberalism that was in the process of retiring royalist and imperialist domination of the world, which, of course, is where the world was at the turn and the beginning of the 20th century as classical liberalism began to replace imperialism and monarchy.

Yes, the two World Wars that we experienced were traumas that still im-

pact our lives. The Treaty of Versailles that ended World War I was the last gasp of European colonialism.

□ 1800

Maps drawn at that international gathering brought on World War II. Some of those other lines that they drew on that map plague us to this day.

Those national borders mandated by the Versailles Treaty made the world temporarily tranquil. Maybe we just heard about that a few moments ago, how we have got to overcome the tragedy right now, like we did in Korea, by not having confrontations with those people who were engaged in hostile activity.

Yes, the Treaty of Versailles gave the world temporary tranquility, but doomed following generations to instability and conflict. Such future challenges were left to the League of Nations. When that failed, the baton was passed to the United Nations.

Humanity, obviously, hoped that global government, in one form or the other, would solve everything. The EU, the common market, NATO, and other multinational bureaucracies would demonstrate how nation-states can cooperate and achieve a collective peace, freedom, and prosperity.

Well, just as things changed dramatically after the 19th century turned into the 20th century, and it became a different world, so, too, is our world changing. We must make sure that we have turned from the 20th century into the 21st.

The 20th century was dominated by the wars and by the defeat of the Soviet Union. Yet we are plagued with conflicts and upheavals that can be traced back to border and sovereign decisions made long ago by people who are now dead, not only from the 20th century, but, as I said, from the end of World War I.

Many of the confrontations between various nationalities that we face today could be solved and the greatest threats of violence, insurrection, and war itself could be defused if our world would again recognize the right of self-determination.

It seems to have been forgotten that the United States was not only founded on the principles of liberty and independence, but also of the right of people to demand their rights, and, yes, that right of independence. They had a right to declare their independence.

This was the revolutionary idea that people have a right to select their government. This was the revolutionary idea that gave our Founding Fathers and Mothers the moral high ground to free themselves from the British Empire. Without this, they probably would not have won, if it were just a battle between powermongers.

No. This was what the fundamental beliefs were: life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, but also the right of people to declare themselves free and independent to create a country based on shared beliefs and shared ideals and values.

This is what we hope—those shared values and beliefs in liberty and justice—are the things that unite us today. That is what united had our Founding Fathers and Mothers and that is what made us a nation. After all, we don't have one race or one religion or one ethnic group to identify us as being Americans and create that unity.

But that said, there are many other countries of the world whose nationalism and patriotism are based on the fact that they have an identity with other people that share their cultural and racial identities. This is what unites them as a people. They are ethnically the same, they are culturally the same, and they have the same type of national and racial roots in their past.

Yes, this is what most countries are like. That is what defines a nationality. Recognizing that people of similar values and culture do not want to live in the subjugation of others has been ignored and/or rejected by the powers that be throughout the world.

So we live in a world where this idea of just recognizing that people want to be like people with similar people. For example, you have differences between Catholics and Protestants in many areas of the world.

Yes, they like to have people who maybe speak their same language and have the same culture, enjoy the same music. There is nothing wrong with people identifying others as being part of their national family. We should promote that as a positive, rather than as a negative. We should encourage people to work together.

There are many, for example, Jewish charities, which is wonderful that Jewish people now, because they have gone through a certain amount of oppression throughout the world, take care of each other in Jewish charities. We have that. We have Catholic schools and different things.

Yes, it is meant because people do share certain values that they can work together on. That is a good thing. However, the idea that people like that might want to be in their own country, which is what our Founding Fathers said, because it was only shared values, it wasn't specific that we wanted freedom of religion for all people.

Well, today the world is threatened by people who want to be independent of domination of others who don't share their same values and their nationality. The reason why it is being rejected is basically by the power brokers throughout the world because it threatens those in power with losing authority over people who don't want to live under their domination.

That is what self-determination is all about: letting people decide their own fate. If a majority of people in an area want to be independent of a country, that is what they should be, according to our Declaration of Independence. And this is something that brings a

more peaceful world, rather than trying to have subjugation of one people by another.

There has been a major cause of conflict in the world today when people don't recognize that, yes, there are others who feel that they are being oppressed by being forced under the jurisdiction of a particular government. They would like to have their own independence.

This, of course, has been especially true where people, since the end of the Cold War, have started looking at their own self-identification. When the right of self-determination is recognized, disputes are usually settled peacefully, as happened when, for example, after the fall of communism, the Czechs and the Slovaks, who had one country before, under the Treaty of Versailles, Czechoslovakia became the Czech Republic and the Slovak Republic. Well, that is fine. It is a good thing that they were able to separate. Now they can be friends.

But when they were one country, if the Czechs and Slovaks felt like they were being oppressed, they weren't satisfied. It was a good thing to permit them right off the bat: If you don't want to be part of the country with us, yes, you can be a separate country. Otherwise, there would have been turmoil at one level or another.

We also saw a peaceful solution in countries like Slovenia. Yugoslavia was breaking up, Tito was dead, the Cold War was over, and guess what. Slovenia and a bunch of other republics within Yugoslavia wanted to be independent, and they were able to do it.

Well, perhaps they were able to do it because the Serbs had already launched attacks on the Croatians and the Kosovars and other people in Yugoslavia that now was splitting apart because these people wanted to be independent and free, but the Serbs attacked them.

They didn't attack Slovenia, because I think by that time they realized that they could not succeed going to war with all of these various groups. Had the Kosovars and the Croatians been free to go and separate and become independent countries—as Croatia is today, and as the Kosovars would like to be, and as we are trying to help them to be—that would have been better for Serbia. It would have been better for everybody. There would have probably been by now an agreement for some kind of free trade zone.

Instead, when the Serbs used force to keep those people under its jurisdiction, we had violence throughout the Balkans that has lasted for several decades. That is a tragedy. We should be working today in the Balkans.

Let me just note that the Serbs today are an example of people who are reaching out, for example, to the Kosovars and others to try to find peaceful solutions and trying to come to some agreements that will make peace more likely.

But, again, if you would have had people who were under their thumb,

nobody would be talking to them because they would be afraid of them. No. People who treat other people as equals and have rights as people in the world, they are more likely to reach understandings that are of mutual cooperation that will bring peace to the world.

I am not trying to say you have to submit yourself to some other group of people. The former Soviet Union, Ukraine, and other of the so-called Soviet republics were actually permitted at the end of the Cold War to, basically, peacefully establish their own independence. I know it is not as simple as that, but it happened in a peaceful way in which thousands of lives were not lost trying to force groups of people who do not want to be under Moscow's control.

Those people, whether Ukraine or elsewhere in the Baltics or the Balkans, had the right—and also in Central Asia—and people were permitted to have, basically, an independent government free from being only suppressed by Moscow and have to follow its orders.

That happened relatively peacefully. Had that not happened, there probably would be conflict throughout that part of the world today. There certainly would have been, as communism faltered in Russia itself.

So it took a lot of prodding for us to make sure that the Russians in the Soviet Union, in Moscow, understood that they could not keep people under their thumb. It was the Cold War.

Thank God, we ended the Cold War peacefully, because that was the great gift that Ronald Reagan gave to us. I am very proud to have served with Ronald Reagan for 7 years in the White House as a senior speechwriter to the President for 7½ years, as well as being a Special Assistant to the President and very involved with his efforts to try to move peace in the world. A lot of it was peace by recognizing people's right to independence.

Look back, for example—Ronald Reagan was an Irish American—at the needless violence that the British perpetrated and what happened in Ireland because the British insisted that the Irish be kept under British rule for so long, when it was clear that the Irish people wanted to be independent of Great Britain.

Look at what happened, in contrast, in Singapore and Malaysia, where the British just peacefully permitted those countries that were basically under the domination—they were part of Great Britain and the British Empire—to leave and establish their independence peacefully. Then Malaysia and Singapore separated from Great Britain, and then separated from each other, peacefully.

But in any one of these cases, if somebody demanded that these people stay in this particular status within this particular government, there would have been a lot more violence.

When self-determination is respected, peace is more likely. When a people are

subjugated to the orders of a government in a country they don't want to be part of, violence is more likely.

How easy is that?

Special interests and power elites throughout the world are not so inclined to this obvious reason.

Why?

Because it is not in their interest to let people just go when they have them right there under their control.

So let's look at a few examples where self-determination has manifest itself in conflict.

Today, one of the greatest conflict areas of the world is the Middle East. Again, many of the conflicts that we have seen, if not a majority, can be traced right back to the Treaty of Versailles, right back to World War I, and the decisions of colonialists and imperialists and royalists to draw borders in the Middle East, just as they did in Africa and elsewhere, which made no sense.

Yes, we ended up separating whole nations. For example, one nation of people that we are aware of today are the Kurds. The Kurds were separated into various countries in the Treaty of Versailles by these British and French colonialists.

And we are supposed to just abide by their decision of what the borders should be today, 100 years later?

No, I don't think so.

□ 1815

The Kurds, of course, were not living just subjugating themselves to what they had been dictated. No, the Kurds have been our greatest ally in the fight against radical Islamic terrorism, and what they are doing today and what they just voted on recently was they had a vote to determine if their people wanted self-determination and wanted to be an independent country from Iraq.

Yes, that was a good thing, and we should recognize that. They won overwhelmingly, and we should look at the map of—we should say a map of the Middle East needs to be changed so you can have a Kurdistan that flows all the way from Turkey and Iraq and Iran and Syria. There are more, for example, Kurds in Iran than there are in Iraq. In Turkey, there are more Kurds, and, of course, in Syria.

This should be a modern country. Why are we letting this turmoil go on when our greatest allies are looking for their own self-determination and these other countries are becoming or are already our enemies? Yes, it will behoove the United States to support the independence of Kurdistan and all the Kurds. We should support in bringing together these Kurdish people as a nation, because that is what they are. They are a nation without a state. Let them have their country.

There has been so much bloodshed in trying to repress the Kurds from the Iranians, from the mullah regime, but also the Shah before him. The Kurds were oppressed by Saddam Hussein,

and right now, what we have is a repression of people even in Iran where the mullah regime is oppressing not only the rest of its people, not only the other people who make up Iran, but the Kurds, in particular.

Look at what is going on with the Baloch, for example. Now, a small group—there are groups of people. There is an area in Iran where the vast majority of people are of the Baloch extraction. They would like their independence. They deserve their right to self-determination, and they are not suffering from the oppression of Iran.

By the way, if we are going to try to deal with Iran, let's not ratchet up our military and threaten to attack them that way. Let's ratchet up our support for people like the Kurds and the Baloch and the Azaris and other people who live in Iran who don't like the oppression of the mullahs, and we can even be supportive of the Persian people who hate the mullah regime.

These are not our enemies in Iran. It is the mullah regime, the fanatics that would drop a bomb on us and not even think twice because they think they are doing God's work. They are the enemy. So we need to be supporting, for example, the Baloch, when I talk about in Iran. The Baloch are also persecuted, mainly persecuted by the Pakistanis who have them under their thumb, and they murder people constantly. They pick these young people up and they murder them, and then they drop their bodies in little villages just to show people what is going to happen to them if they try to resist Pakistani authority.

This is the history of Pakistan. Right now they are doing it to the Baloch, to the Sindhis, to the Singhs, you name it. You have got just a group of people—except for, of course, the Punjabis and then others, the Pashtuns who control that Government in Pakistan.

Well, remember what happened before. We have seen it before. When the people of Bangladesh wanted to be a little independent of the Pakistani Government, have some way to, you know, control their own lives and control their own government, they were brutally repressed by the Pakistani Government, and that is what led to, basically, the uprising of the people in Bangladesh when they freed themselves.

Remember, that same type of oppression is continuing not only on the Baloch, but, for example, the populations that came over from India, after India and Pakistan split. A lot of them went to Karachi. Those people in Karachi now, there are people who want to have Karachi—it is like a Singapore of that part of the world, an independent. That is what they want to do because they have a right of self-determination.

They don't want to be subjugated by this corrupt, militaristic, proterrorist Government in Pakistan. We should be siding with people like that who want their independence and believe in these same values that we believe in.

Another example of that, of course, is what we see in Spain today. Today, of course, now there are groups of people who live in Catalonia. Catalonia is a province with a long history in Spain. People identify themselves as Catalonians. Yes, Spanish, but also Catalonians. They should have a right to vote on whether or not they want to remain part of Spain, whether or not they give up their sovereignty to a central government in Madrid or do they want to have a government of Catalonia that they can have their own government, and yes, their own sovereignty.

Well, the Spanish overreaction to the efforts of the Catalonians just to have a poll—basically it was a vote on independence, but it was—you know, basically it had to be recognized for it to have effect. But instead of letting them do this and just saying, "Well, it has no legal effect," instead, the Spanish Government came down with brute force and conducted violence, as you would think violence coming from terrorists would exert on a group of people in Spain. It was their own government that was exercising violence and force and intimidation against the people of Catalonia.

Now, of course, the people of Catalonia are united because they know the brutality and subjugation of what is going on with Madrid.

Now, the British knew how to do it. Unlike Madrid and Spain, the British permitted their people in Scotland to have a vote, and that was a wonderful thing. The Scots had their vote, there was no interference, and if they didn't want to be part of Great Britain, they didn't have to be, and that was a wonderful example to the world of how you should do this.

Now, the Scots decided to stay part of England, part of Great Britain. That is fine, but they had their chance. The people in Spain weren't given that chance. No, instead their government came down and beat them up when they tried to go to the polls. And let's say also, the British seemed also to be demonstrating, they believe, in self-determination.

They are exiting—they are taking the Brexit issue of whether or not you should have Britain as part of the EU and the common market. That vote that they allowed their people to decide, it wasn't decided by an elite. The Brexit vote let all the people of Britain decide whether or not they were going to be basically part of a subjugated people in Europe or whether they were going to be an independent force and a nation, which is their history as a people of Great Britain.

I am proud that they permitted Scotland to vote, and I am also proud that they voted not to subjugate themselves to the EU and to the common market, et cetera.

We need to make sure that we stay true to our principles and have a vision about what this world will be. If you are just looking at things of what we

can do every day, Ronald Reagan succeeded because he had a vision of a peaceful world based on those individual rights and those concepts of freedom and democracy that were at the heart of the American experience, but also an America that encompassed people from all over the world.

Reagan had a vision, and it wasn't to get into a war with the Soviet Union and destroy communism. Reagan's vision was let's have—yes, we have to have strength in our military in order to defeat this enemy of Soviet communism, because it was threatening the world peace. It was taking over countries and overthrowing governments and replacing them with atheist dictatorships. Reagan knew we had to stop that.

Just like today, our primary enemy today is no longer the Soviet Union because Reagan helped eliminate the Soviet Union, the communist threat. The threat today is radical Islamic terrorists who will murder our people and are murdering people all over the world and murdering people in their own countries in order to terrorize them into submission.

Well, the bottom line is, Ronald Reagan's vision succeeded with Russia because, at that time, it was the Soviet Union, and now we have a Russia that we have so much more potential.

Now, there are a lot of flaws. There are a lot of flaws in the Russian Government, and there are things that we have to make sure that we are taking care of and standing firm on, but, by and large, we have to understand that they, today, are being attacked and murdered by radical Islamic terrorists as well. They know that, and they know the dangers that we face because they face a common danger.

We need to work to build a new alliance because what is happening is, Islam is making such inroads into the stupidity of our western European allies that the western Europe that we know—here again, time is going on, 19th century into the 20th century. Now we are in the 21st century. The 21st century will see that Europe becomes a whole different place than what it has been for the last 150 or 200 years.

There will be Islamic countries in Europe, and they will be, then, either part of or they will not fight against a radical Islamic terrorist threat that today threatens the peace of the world just as the Soviet Union did that 10 years, or I should say, 10 decades ago.

So with that, we need a vision, and one vision that we should have is, number one, a vision of self-determination that we all agree on.

Number two, let's make sure that we ally ourselves in a positive way with people who are not going to be weakened by the onslaught of Islam. I would suggest that America will be a more peaceful place and our country will be more secure and the world will be more peaceful and secure if we establish a new relationship in which we are

watching out for each other with four countries. The United States, of course; the other one is India, and I will soon be going to India. In fact, I will be going to India tomorrow. And number three, Japan; and number four, Russia.

Now, there is some work that needs to be done to make a coalition like that real, but a coalition of those countries working together, not mandated that we have to do this and we have to subjugate ourselves to decisions of what the four say, but, instead, seeking out cooperation with those countries where there is mutual benefit to do, we can make this a better world. We can secure our prosperity and secure the peace of our own country and the security of our own country.

So with a vision and with a recognition of fundamental things like the right of self-determination and the right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness that our Founding Fathers talked about, and limited government where they said government only derives its just powers from the consent of the governed, let us champion these values and these ideals.

Let us have a vision for the future, as Ronald Reagan did, and we can make this a more peaceful world as we side with people all over the world who want to control their own destiny by having their own nation rather than being subjected to someone else.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CLYBURN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1595. An act to amend the Hizballah International Financing Prevention Act of 2015 to impose additional sanctions with respect to Hizballah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs; in addition, to the Committee on the Judiciary; and to the Committee on Financial Services for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, October 16, 2017, at 10 a.m.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MCCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 3669. A bill to improve and streamline security procedures related to general aviation and commercial charter air carrier utilizing risk-based security standards, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-346). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII, the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 3017. Referral to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure extended for a period ending not later than November 9, 2017.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. MCHENRY:

H.R. 4028. A bill to amend the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Act of 1978 to establish cybersecurity supervision and examination of large consumer reporting agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 4029. A bill to direct the Secretary of Education to make reasonable adjustments to earnings data for graduates of cosmetology gainful employment programs; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Ms. LEE, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. SCHA-KOWSKY, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mrs. DAVIS of California):

H.R. 4030. A bill to amend the Department of Education Organization Act to codify into law the "Revised Sexual Harassment Guidance: Harassment of Students by School Employees, Other Students, or Third Parties", issued January 19, 2001, by the Office for Civil Rights of the Department of Education, as in effect on January 1, 2017; the Dear Colleague letter issued April 4, 2011, by the Office for Civil Rights of the Department of Education, as in effect on January 1, 2017; and the "Questions and Answers on Title IX and Sexual Violence" issued April 29, 2014, by the Office for Civil Rights of the Department of Education, as in effect on January 1, 2017; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 4031. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit to Congress annual reports on beneficiary travel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provi-

sions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. O'HALLERAN (for himself, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GALLEGOS, Mr. GOSAR, and Mr. SCHWEIKERT):

H.R. 4032. A bill to confirm undocumented Federal rights-of-way or easements on the Gila River Indian Reservation, clarify the northern boundary of the Gila River Indian Community's Reservation, to take certain land located in Maricopa County and Pinal County, Arizona, into trust for the benefit of the Gila River Indian Community, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LAMBORN (for himself and Mr. BROWN of Maryland):

H.R. 4033. A bill to reauthorize the National Geologic Mapping Act of 1992; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HARPER (for himself, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, and Mr. PALAZZO):

H.R. 4034. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to issue to the Pat Harrison Waterway District a long-term special use permit to develop approximately 8,307 acres of National Forest System land within the Bienville National Forests in Mississippi, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WEBER of Texas (for himself, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. SESSIONS):

H.R. 4035. A bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to repeal certain loan guarantee programs of the Department of Energy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology, and Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRAVES of Georgia (for himself and Ms. SINEMA):

H.R. 4036. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide a defense to prosecution for fraud and related activity in connection with computers for persons defending against unauthorized intrusions into their computers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. HARTZLER:

H.R. 4037. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the non-applicability of non-Department of Veterans Affairs covenants not to compete to the appointment of certain Veterans Health Administration personnel; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MCCAUL (for himself and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi):

H.R. 4038. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to reassert article I authorities over the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself and Ms. BROWNLEY of California):

H.R. 4039. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to limit the number of local wage areas allowable within a General Schedule pay locality; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. LEE, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LOWEY,